UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,652	11/16/2001	David J. Green	0325.00488	2156

21363 7590 11/02/2005

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.
24840 HARPER SUITE 100
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080

EXAMINER	
EHICHIOYA, FRED I	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/992,652	GREEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred I. Ehichioya	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 10, and 21 - 33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1 - 10, and 21 - 33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/28/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 28, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Double Patenting

2. The terminal disclaimer filed on July 28, 2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 09/992,652 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 23, 25, 27 and 29 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim is hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments/Remarks

4. Applicants' arguments, with respect to claims 1 – 10, and 21 – 33 have been fully considered and but are not are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of last Office Action is proper.

Applicants argue:

(a) Applicants have not made express admission that the material in the Background of the Invention section of the application qualifies as prior art under b35 U.S.C. 102 and/ or 103 (page 10, paragraph 6).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants. Applicants disclose the invention of JEDEC published June 1994 and submitted as a prior art. Unless the applicants are the author of this document, the disclosure of any part of the invention By the applicants is considered as admitted prior art. Even if the JEDEC is published by the inventors of the instant applicantion, the disclosure is still considered as admitted prior art because it qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C 102.

(b) Kalkstien appears to be non-analogous art to the background section of the application (page 11, paragraph 2).

In response to applicant's argument that Kalkstein is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this

case, Kalkstein is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned.

(c) Prima facie obviousness has not been established for lack of clear and particular evidence of motivation to combine the reference (page 11, paragraph 3).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, by combining Huffman encoding with "applicants admitted prior art", APA's system would have gained a significant increase of speed in exchange for slight or negligible degradation of the compression capacity.

(d) Background section of the application and Kalkstein, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a step for storing the compressed item in a plurality of first non-programming fields as presently claimed (page 12, paragraph 2).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. APA discloses "the non-programmable type information is stored in the non-programming fields of the file" see page 2, lines 7 – 9 of the specification and Kalkstein discloses compressed item as shown in column 3, lines 53 - 55. Though not explicitly stated, it is inherent that APA and Kalkstein suggest a

step for storing the compressed item in a plurality of first non-programming fields. It is most certain that APA and Kalkstein could have been modified to achieve a step for storing the compressed item in a plurality of first non-programming fields.

(e) Background section of the application and Kalkstein, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a step for storing at least one non-programming type information item in a second non-programming field of the file as presently claimed (page 13, paragraph 2).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. APA discloses "the non-programmable type information is stored in the non-programming fields of the file" see page 2, lines 7 – 9 of the specification. Though not explicitly stated, it is inherent that APA suggests a step for storing programming type information item in a second non-programmable field. It is most certain that APA could have been modified to achieve a step for storing programming type information item in a second non-programmable field.

(g) Background section of the application and Kalkstein, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a structure comprising (i) means for transferring a file and (ii) means for generating a programming item as presently claimed (page 14, paragraph 2).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "structure comprising:") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). However, Kucukcakar discloses means for transferring a file (see column 2, lines 25 – 41) and APA discloses "means for generating a programming item as shown in page 2, lines 3 - 6 of the specification. Though not explicitly stated, it is inherent that APA suggests a means for generating a programming and Kucukcakar discloses means for transferring a file.

(h) Background section of the application and Kalkstein, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a step for storing at least one parameters in a third non-programming field of the file as presently claimed (page 15, paragraph 1).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. APA discloses "the step of storing at least one of said parameters in a third non-programming field of said file" see page 2, lines 7 – 9 of the specification. Though not explicitly stated, it is inherent that APA suggests a step for storing at least one of said parameters in a third non-programming field. It is most certain that APA could have been modified to achieve a step for storing at least one of said parameters in a third non-programming field of said file.

(i) Background section of the application and Kalkstein, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest that a dictionary is generated independently of compressing step as presently claimed (page 15, paragraph 2).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kalkstein discloses that a dictionary is generated independently of compressing step as shown in column 15, lines 61 – 65.

(j) Background section of the application and Kalkstein, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest the step of encoding said compressed item from a binary representation to a symbol representation in response to compressing (page 16, paragraph 3).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kalkstein discloses the step of encoding said compressed item from a binary representation to a symbol representation in response to compressing (see column 2, lines 28 - 32).

(k) Dabbish appears to be non-analogous art to the background section of the application and Kalkstein (page 16, paragraph 3).

In response to applicant's argument that Dabbish is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Dabbish is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned.

(l) ***Background section of the application, Kalkstein and Dabbish, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a step of extracting error detection item from the file (page 17, paragraph 1) or parsing a plurality of first comments lines containing compressed the compressed item from the file using plurality of first delimiters (page 18, paragraph 1).***

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kalkstein teaches wherein said step of extracting said compressed item comprises the sub-step of parsing a plurality of first comment lines containing said compressed item from said file using a plurality of first delimiters (see column 5, lines 7 – 9).

(m) ***Stanley appears to be non-analogous art to the background section of the application (page 18, paragraph 3) and Background section of the application, Kalkstein and Stanley, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a step of adding plurality of delimiters around the compressed item in a plurality of third non-programming field (page 18, paragraph 3).***

In response to applicant's argument that Stanley is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Stanley is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned. Stanley teaches the step of adding plurality of delimiters around said compressed item in said non-programmable field (see column 3, line 50 – column 4, line

5). The motivation to combine Stanley is that it will allow APA and Kalkstein's system to provide a data compression and decompression method that combines both a variable-length and fixed-length encoding as suggested by Stanley in column 2, lines 10 – 12. This produces small compressed data buffers and also allows for efficient decoding.

(o) Har appears to be non-analogous art to the background section of the application (page 19, paragraph 2) and Background section of the application, Kalkstein and Har, alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest a step for decompressing the compressed item to present a backup programming item (page 20, paragraph 2)

In response to applicant's argument that Har is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Har is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned. Har teaches decompressing said compressed item to present a backup programming item (see column 5, lines 39 - 44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1 – 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA") in view of U.S. Patent 6,121,903 issued to Nir Kalkstein (hereinafter "Kalkstein").

Regarding claim 1, APA teaches a method of generating a file suitable for programming a programmable logic device, the method comprising the steps of:

A) generating a programming item from a plurality of parameters that define a program for said programmable logic device (see page 2, lines 3 - 6);

(C) storing said programming item in a programming field of said file (see page 2, lines 6 - 7); and

(D) storing said "in a plurality of first non-programming fields of said file (see page 2, lines 7 – 9; APA discloses "non-programming fields", it is inherent that APA could be modified to include 1 - ∞ non-programming fields, therefore APA discloses storing said in a plurality of first non-programming fields).

(F) Storing at least one non-programming type information item in a second non-programmable field of said file (see page 2, lines 7 – 9; APA discloses "non-programming fields", it is inherent that APA could be modified to include 1 - ∞ non-programming fields, therefore APA discloses storing at least one non-programming type information item in a second non-programmable field).

APA does not explicitly teach Compressed item as claimed and (B) compressing said programming item to present a compressed item.

Kalkstein teaches compressed items (see column 4, lines 35 – 49); and

(B) compressing said programming item to present a compressed item (see column 3, lines 53 - 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Kalkstein's teaching of "compressing said programming item to present a compressed item" would have allowed APA's system an improved implementation of the Huffman encoding, thereby gaining a significant increase of speed in exchange for slight or negligible degradation of the compression capacity.

Further, APA's system will have an improved encoding scheme which provides for achieving better compression as suggested by Kalkstein at column 6, lines 45 - 50.

Regarding claim 2, APA teaches the step of storing at least one of said parameters in a third non-programming field of said file (see page 2, lines 7 – 9; APA discloses storing said "non-programmable type information" in non-programming fields. It is inherent that APA could be modified to include 1 - ∞ non-programming fields, therefore the "non-programmable type information" that are translated as "parameters" are stored in a third of these non-programming fields).

Regarding claim 3, Kalkstein teaches the step of generating a dictionary for compressing prior to compressing said programming item (see column 11, lines 47 - 50).

Regarding claim 4, Kalkstein teaches wherein said dictionary is generated independently of said compressing step (see column 15, lines 61 - 65).

Regarding claim 5, Kalkstein teaches said compressing is a Huffman encoding and said dictionary is a Huffman tree (see column 12, lines 6 - 27).

Regarding claim 6, Kalkstein teaches the step of encoding said compressed item from a binary representation to a symbol representation in response to compressing (see column 2, lines 28 - 32).

Regarding claim 7, Kalkstein teaches the step of mapping said symbol representation to a character representation in response to encoding (see column 2, lines 28 - 32).

Regarding claim 22, APA teaches said file is compatible with a Joint Electron Device Engineering Council JESD3-C standard (see page 1, lines 14 - 16).

7. Claims 8, 9, 10, 27 and 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kalkstein and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,090,015 issued to Ezzat A. Dabbish et al (hereafter "Dabbish").

Regarding claim 8, APA teaches third non-programming field as shown in claim 2.

APA or Kalkstein does not explicitly teach generating an error detection item; and storing said error detection item as claimed.

Dabbish teaches generating an error detection item (see column 1, lines 56 - 57); and

storing said error detection item (see column 2, lines 29 - 39) in a third

non-programming field of said file (see APA: page 2, lines 7 – 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Dabbish's teaching of "storing said error detection item" would have allowed APA and Kalkstein's system to provide a technique for verifying the integrity of the encrypted algorithm by self-checking it during programming, after completion of programming and prior to execution as suggested by Dabbish in column 1, lines 10 – 13.

Regarding claim 9, Dabbish teaches extracting error detection item from file (see column 1, lines 49 – 57).

Regarding claim 10, Dabbish teaches said steps (A) through (E) are stored in a storage medium as a computer program that is readable and executable by a computer to generate said file (see column 3, lines 60 - 63).

Regarding claim 27, Kalkstein teaches wherein said step of extracting said compressed item comprises the sub-step of parsing a plurality of first comment lines containing said compressed item from said file using a plurality of first delimiters (see column 5, lines 7 – 9).

Regarding claim 31, Kalkstein teaches extracting said compressed item from said file (see column 4, lines 35 – 41).

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kalkstein and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,396,595 issued to Benji J. Stanley (hereafter "Stanley").

Regarding claim 21, APA teaches third non-programming field as shown in claim 2 and Kalkstein teaches compressed item as shown in claim 1 (B).

APA or Kalkstein does not explicitly teach the step of adding plurality of delimiters around said compressed item as claimed.

Stanley teaches the step of adding plurality of delimiters around said compressed item in a plurality of third non-programmable field (see column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Stanley's teaching of "adding plurality of delimiters around said compressed item" would have allowed APA and Kalkstein's system to provide a data compression and decompression method that combines both a variable-length and fixed-length encoding as suggested by Stanley in column 2, lines 10 – 12.

9. Claims 23, 24, 29, 32 and 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kalkstein and Dabbish and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,446,145 issued to David Har et al (hereafter "Har").

Regarding claim 32, APA, Kalkstein or Dabbish does not explicitly teach decompressing said compressed item to present a backup programming item.

Har teaches decompressing said compressed item to present a backup programming item (see column 5, lines 39 - 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Har's teaching of "decompressing said compressed item to present a backup programming item" would have allowed APA, Kalkstein and Dabbish's system to provide a data management mechanism in a compressed memory system that functions to minimize processor stall conditions due to cache write back queuing at the compressor as suggested by Har in column 4, lines 8 - 11.

Regarding claim 33, Har teaches validating said backup programming item with error detection item (see column 2, lines 3 – 7 and column 4, lines 34 - 42).

Regarding claim 23, Kalkstein teaches the step of extracting said programming item from said programmable field of said file (see column 4, lines 35 - 41).

Regarding claim 24, Har teaches the step of replacing said programming item with said backup programming item in response to validating said backup programming item (see column 2, lines 3 – 7 and column 4, lines 34 – 42)

Regarding claim 29, Dabbish teaches the step of repairing said error detection item in response to said backup programming item failing said validating step (see column 2, lines 45 – 59).

10. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kalkstein, Dabbish, Har and further in view of Stanley.

Regarding claim 25, APA, Kalkstein, Dabbish or Har does not explicitly teach wherein the step of decompressing said compressed item comprises the sub-step of mapping said compressed item from a character representation to symbol representation in response to extracting said compressed item.

Stanley teaches wherein the step of decompressing said compressed item comprises the sub-step of mapping said compressed item from a character representation to symbol representation in response to extracting said compressed item (see column 2, lines 59 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Stanley's teaching of "mapping said compressed item from a character representation

to symbol representation" would have allowed APA, Kalkstein, Dabbish and Har's system to provide a data compression and decompression method that combines both a variable-length and fixed-length encoding as suggested by Stanley in column 2, lines 10 – 12.

Regarding claim 26, Kalkstein teaches wherein the step of decompressing said compressed item further comprises the sub-step of parsing a plurality of first comments lines containing said compressed item from said file using a plurality of first delimiters (see column 5, lines 7 – 9)

11. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kalkstein and Dabbish and further in view of Stanley.

Regarding claim 28, Kalkstein and Dabbish teach wherein said step of extracting said error detection item comprises the sub-step of parsing at least one second comment line (see Kalkstein: column 5, lines 7 - 9) containing said error detection item from said file (see Dabbish: column 1, lines 56 – 57).

APA, Kalkstein or Dabbish does not explicitly teach using a plurality of second delimiters as claimed.

Stanley teaches using a plurality of second delimiters (see column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Stanley's teaching of "delimiters" would have allowed APA, Kalkstein and Dabbish's system to provide a data compression and decompression method that combines both a variable-length and fixed-length encoding as suggested by Stanley in column 2, lines 10 – 12.

12. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kalkstein and further in view of USPN 6,138,229 issued to Kucukcakar et al (hereinafter "Kucukcakar").

Regarding claim 30, APA teaches an apparatus comprising:

means for (i) generating a programming item from a plurality of parameters that define a program for a programmable logic device (see page 2, lines 3 – 6), (iii) storing said programming item in a programming field of said file (see page 2, lines 6 – 7) and (iv) storing said item in a plurality of non-programming fields of said file (see page 2, lines 7 – 8).

APA does not explicitly teach means for transferring a file; compressed item and

(ii) compressing said programming item to present a compressed item.

Kucukcakar teaches means for transferring a file (see column 2, lines 25 – 41); and Kalkstein teaches compressed item (see column 4, lines 35 – 49) and

(ii) compressing said programming item to present a compressed item (see column 3, lines 53 – 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine teaching of the cited references because Kucukcakar's teaching of "means for transferring a file" would have allowed APA's system to implements complex, time-consuming operations by reconfiguring a portion of the instruction execution unit to perform a group of specific functions in hardware rather than implementing a string of operations in software routines.

Further, Kalkstein's teaching of "compressing said programming item to present a compressed item" would have allowed APA and Kucukcakar's system an improved implementation of the Huffman encoding, thereby gaining a significant increase of speed in exchange for slight or negligible degradation of the compression capacity. This system will have an improved encoding scheme which provides for achieving better compression as suggested by Kalkstein at column 6, lines 45 - 50.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 571-272-4034. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Fred I. Ehichioya
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162

October 18, 2005

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER